

REMARKS

Claims 1-16 are pending in the present Application. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected the claims as follows. Claims 1-7, 13, 14, and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,282,419 B1 (Findikli) in view of International Publication No. WO 01/17125 A1 (Soliman). Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Findikli in view of Soliman and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0094808 A1 (Tiedmann). Claims 9-12 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatenable over Findikli in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,324,399 B1 (Salmivalli) and further in view of Soliman.

As an initial matter, the rejections of Claims 15 and 16 were not properly stated in the Office Action. Accordingly, in a telephonic conversation with the Examiner on November 18, 2005, the Examiner stated that Claim 15 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as per the rejections of Claims 1-7, 13, and 14 and Claim 16 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as per the rejections of Claims 9-12.

Regarding the Examiner's rejection of independent Claim 1, the Examiner states that Findikli does not explicitly disclose the search period is set on the basis of the location information of the MS, which the Examiner states is taught by Soliman. Upon reviewing the cited references, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner is incorrect.

Findikli teaches an apparatus and a method for improving rescan capability of a telecommunications system searching for an Acceptable Service Provider (ASP) after failure of a given mobile terminal to link with the ASP.

Soliman discloses an apparatus and a method for reducing the search time associated with a handoff of a call from one base station to another base station. The Examiner equates the search window size as taught by Soliman with the search period value as recited in Claim 1. However, as taught by Soliman, the search window size refers to an amount of time spent searching for a pilot signal once the search has begun. In other words, the search window refers to the amount of time during which a search is performed. For example, Soliman discloses reducing the search window size from 160 to 14 chips (e.g., see Page 17, Lines 9-17). This contrasts with the search period value recited in Claim 1 wherein the limitation search period value is used to determine times at which to begin a search, rather than the duration of a search as taught by Soliman.

In contrast, Claim 1 includes the recitation of an HLR (Home Location Register) for updating the location information of the MS extracted from the MSC, variably setting a search period value at a time of searching for an HPLMN or higher-priority PLMN on the basis of the location information of the MS and transmitting the set search period

value to the MS, which is neither taught nor suggested by Findikli or Soliman or the combination thereof.

Moreover, the Examiner states that Findikli discloses a HLR (Home Location Register) for variably setting a search period value (Office Action, Page 3), as recited in Claim 1. Findikli discloses the HLR is a database maintaining all subscriber information, e.g., user profiles, current location and routing information, International Mobile Subscriber Identity (IMSI) numbers, and other administrative information, however, Findikli does not teach or suggest an HLR for variably setting a search period value, as recited in Claim 1.

Accordingly, for at least the above-stated reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) of Claim 1 withdrawn.

Regarding the Examiner's rejection of independent Claim 9, the Examiner states that the combination of Findikli and Salmivalli teach all the recitations of Claim 9 except for setting a search period on the basis of the location information of the MS which the Examiner states is taught by Soliman. Upon reviewing the cited references, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner is incorrect.

Findikli and Soliman are discussed above.

Salmivalli teaches a method for controlling subscriber registrations in a mobile

communication system where the subscriber data concerning visiting subscribers is temporarily stored in a visitor location register.

In contrast, Claim 9 includes the recitation of variably setting a search period value at a time of searching for an HPLMN or higher-priority PLMN on the basis of the location information of the MS and transmitting the set search period value to the MS, which is neither taught nor suggested by Findikli, Soliman, or Sanivalli, or the combination thereof.

Accordingly, for at least the above-stated reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) of Claim 9 be withdrawn.

Independent Claims 1 and 9 are believed to be in condition for allowance. Without conceding the patentability per se of dependent Claims 2-8 and 10-16, these are likewise believed to be allowable by virtue of their dependence on their respective amended independent claims. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of dependent Claims 2-8 and 10-16 is respectfully requested.

Accordingly, all of the claims pending in the Application, namely, Claims 1-16, are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a

telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicants' attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul J. Farrell
Reg. No. 33,494
Attorney for Applicant

DILWORTH & BARRESE, LLP
333 Earle Ovington Blvd.
Uniondale, New York 11553
Tel: (516) 228-8484
Fax: (516) 228-8516

PJF/VAG/ml